EXHIBIT I

From: Shannon Gustafson

To: <u>Hang Le</u>

Cc:Diana Esquivel; Amy R. Margolies; Anita K. ClarkeSubject:RE: L.C., et al. (Puga) v. State of CaliforniaDate:Wednesday, December 18, 2024 12:39:01 PM

Hang,

We will agree to provide you with copies of the records. Please withdraw your objections to the entities immediately.

Thanks

Shannon L. Gustafson Shareholder

Direct: (714) 352-3547



1100 W. Town & Country Rd., Suite 1450 Orange, California 92868

www.lynberg.com www.linkedin.com

The information in this email (and any attachments hereto) is confidential and may be protected by legal privileges and work product immunities. If you are not the intended recipient, you must not use or disseminate the information. Receipt by anyone other than the intended recipient is not a waiver of any attorney-client or work product privilege. If you have received this email in error, please immediately notify me by 'Reply' command and permanently delete the original and any copies or printouts thereof. Although this email and any attachments are believed to be free of any virus or other defect that might affect any computer system into which it is received and opened, it is the responsibility of the recipient to ensure that it is virus free and no responsibility is accepted by Lynberg & Watkins for any loss or damage arising in any way from its use.

From: Hang Le <hlee@galipolaw.com>

Sent: Wednesday, December 18, 2024 10:13 AM **To:** Shannon Gustafson <sgustafson@lynberg.com>

Cc: Diana Esquivel < Diana. Esquivel@doj.ca.gov>; Amy R. Margolies < amargolies@lynberg.com>;

Anita K. Clarke <aclarke@lynberg.com>

Subject: RE: L.C., et al. (Puga) v. State of California

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of Lynberg & Watkins. Do not click any links or open any attachments unless you recognize the sender, verified the email address and know the content is safe.

Good morning Shannon,

At the time of the conference with the Magistrate, there was no issue pending because we had yet to meet and confer on this issue, and as we all saw, Judge Kewalramani does not like to be surprised with issues that the parties have not adequately discussed before bringing the issues before him. Additionally, we sent out the letters yesterday because according to our calculations, yesterday was the deadline to timely to object to the subpoenas. Thus, although we still intended on conferring with